

11722 31st Dr. S.E.
Everett, WA. 98208-6117

Chester A. Barr

Nov 20, 2001

Reneta Hesse, Trial Attorney
Antitrust Division
U.S. Department of Justice
601 D. St., Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20530

Dear Honorable Hesse,

I am an ordinary American citizen whose use of the computer is for home use and a treasurer for a church. I have been watching with much interest the unfolding of the Antitrust Case with Microsoft from the newspaper reporting. I am grateful for the privilege to add my feeling over what I see as a sell out of the American people to Microsoft by our Justice Department.

In family life when you have a child bent on doing wrong, even crime, parents have a responsibility to do all possible to correct that wayward child. If the child continues in his wayward crimes, he usually becomes a case for public correction, and at the cost to the public. This is the way I see Microsoft. To this day Microsoft do not accept that they have exercised monopoly power over their competitors to the harm and denial to those of us who use computers desiring to see more innovative software and more control over their own computers.

I respectfully disagree with the U.S. Department of Justice's settlement with Microsoft. First, because in the name of "U.S. economy" and pressure from the Bush Administration is not reason to pat Microsoft's hands and turn them loose again to continue their monopoly practices. They have been found guilty of exercising monopoly power, so how can our government and our Justice Department, for the sake of money, to improve the economy, justify to turn them loose with only a tap of the hand. If our government and Justice Department, who are charged to meet out justice, act for reasons not fitting the crime, how then can the American public feel they have representation?

I have observed Microsoft officials using their money power to buy their way with legislators and with those holding high office, meeting with them, dining with them, contributing to their political interest. I ask the question, how can the consumers in this industry compete for hearing, seeing such money flowing, and our politicians reaching for the grab.

Eighteen of our State Attorney Generals have come forth representing Microsoft competitors. Believe nine of them have agreed to accept the Justice Department's deal with Microsoft. Some of them have given in to avoid time and expense that their respective state

governments deem they cannot afford. I praise the other nine State Attorneys who have stayed the course for justice and for more realistic restrictions on Microsoft.

I note Bob Lade, an antitrust expert at the University of Baltimore allegedly said, "it's odd that the Justice Department -- at the end of the filing -- outlined stricter remedies that it had considered without explaining why those remedies were not pursued" and continued by saying, "This is, of course, the case of the generation so I would have expected more".

I do not believe for a moment that the settlement the Justice Department has arrived at with Microsoft will remedy the monopoly power. As earlier stated Microsoft have not recognized that they have been a monopoly or acted with monopoly power over their competition so why would they change course.

In closing if fair and competitive opportunities are going to be available, the deal that has been cut will not do it, and I urge stricter remedies, that will give equal opportunities for all and customers have a choice what is on their computers.

Respectfully submitted,


Chester A. Barr